

**II. REMARKS**

**A. Status**

**1. Present Paper**

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, and 13 are amended to overcome the rejections based on the cited prior art. No new matter has been added.

Claims 5, 11, and 14 are canceled.

Finally, new claims 15 and 16 are added, but no new matter has been introduced.

**2. Office Action**

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,014,680 (“Sato”). Office Action at 2.

**B. Current Claims**

The claims of the present paper are amended to overcome Sato and now recite a structured document (instance) complying with a first document structure definition (first schema) may change its structure due to the additional processing such as encryption or digital signature. See amended claims, above. Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are characterized by a process for converting a first schema into a second schema by applying a conversion rule to the first schema, thereby making it possible to inspect the instance on an element-by-element basis by using the second schema. New independent claim 16 is also characterized by dynamically switching the schema to be complied with during document structure inspection from the first schema to the second the moment when the first schema becomes out of use, to follow the change in a structure of the instance.

C. **The Sato Reference Does Not Anticipate the Present Claims**

Sato aims to convert a non-structured document into a structured document (instance). It is clear that Sato's object is totally different from that of the present claims.

While Sato converts a plain document instance into the structured instance, the present claims recite a conversion from one schema into another. More specifically, while the information Sato adds or substitutes is merely the tagged character strings in a structured document, such as <LAW>, the target information in the present claims is a document structure definition, as shown in step 1012 of Fig. 10.

Whereas Sato adds no more than a tagged character string to the non-structured document, the present claims recite a conversion of document structure definition or a schema from the original schema.

Sato's SGML document correcting module 115 replaces a string "#PCDATA" that is enclosed with a start-tag and an end-tag in an instance 1602 with a corresponding instance enclosed with the same tags in a change module 1603 (column 14, lines 1-46). The present independent claims replace an element name of the first schema with an element name of a relevant schema, further adding the relevant schema (Fig. 10, steps 1010 and 1012).

Moreover, Sato conducts the Add processing in a parsing module 105 while doing the Replace processing by the module 105. Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 recite both the Add processing and the Replace processing within one integrated conversion processing.

Accordingly, the present claims are not anticipated by Sato et al.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, we believe the claims are in a condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



David A. Spenard  
Registration No. 37,449

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 DAS:ajb  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
Date: March 21, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**